

PART 6

PHASE I

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

WASHINGTON STATE FERRIES

NEW 130 – AUTO FERRIES DESIGN AND BUILD CONTRACT

PHASE I PROPOSAL EVALUATION

1 The following is a description of the Phase I proposal evaluation process under the modified
2 Request For Proposals (RFP) for the New 130-Auto Ferries Design and Build Contract. For
3 specific details, all proposers should refer to the Phase I Proposer Instructions, Proposal
4 Requirements and RFP Volumes II through VI.

5 6 7 **1. GENERAL**

8
9 WSF is utilizing a modified RFP solicitation process for this project, as authorized by
10 RCW 47.60.810 *et seq.* In Phase I, WSF will evaluate the proposers' qualifications
11 and capabilities as part of the process to select the best qualified proposers, in
12 accordance with RCW 47.60.816, for participation in development of Technical
13 Proposals in Phase II. Under such a process, the Phase I selection of the best
14 qualified proposers will be based upon evaluation factors specified in the RFP.

15
16 WSF shall evaluate each Phase I proposal for: (i) successful prequalification, per the
17 RFP proposer instructions; and (ii) selection as one of the best qualified proposers
18 (see Evaluation Factors below).

19 20 21 **2. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS**

22
23 A proposer must meet the Prequalification Requirements discussed in RFP Volume
24 IA, Part 3, Prequalification, in order for its proposal to be considered for this RFP.

25
26 WSF will evaluate each proposal for compliance with these Minimum Requirements,
27 using a pass/fail analysis. Any proposal that does not meet these Minimum
28 Requirements shall be disqualified from further consideration under this RFP.
29

1
2 **3. EVALUATION FACTORS**
3

4 Following the prequalification process, Phase I proposal evaluation shall consist of
5 weighted factor evaluation to rank the proposals.
6

7 Proposal evaluation factors to determine the best qualified proposers to participate in
8 Phase II shall be as follows:
9

- 10 A. Shipyard Facilities;
11 B. Design Capability;
12 C. Build Strategy;
13 D. Experience and Past Performance; and
14 E. Organization, Systems and Procedures.
15

16 A Summary of Phase I Evaluation Factors, including their weighted values, is
17 attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A.
18
19

20 **4. EVALUATION PROCESS**
21

22 Proposal evaluation shall be divided into: (i) a pass/fail evaluation of the Minimum
23 Requirements specified in Section 2 herein; and (ii) an evaluation to identify the best
24 qualified proposers.
25

26 A Summary of Phase I Evaluation Process is attached hereto and incorporated herein
27 as Exhibit B. WSF will evaluate the proposals in accordance with the evaluation
28 factors, scoring methodology and evaluation process specified herein.
29
30

31 **5. SCORING METHODOLOGY**
32

33 There are maximum points established for each evaluation category and sub-
34 components thereof. The value of each primary category is specified in Exhibit A.
35 However, to ensure the highest quality proposals, the detailed point schedule is
36 confidential until after selection of the best qualified proposers.
37

38 For each evaluation category, the evaluators assign points, and the point assignments
39 of all such evaluators are averaged to obtain the final score. The details of the
40 evaluation scoring process will be provided to interested parties, upon request, after
41 selection of the best qualified proposers.
42
43

1
2 **6. BASIS FOR SELECTION**
3

4 Following the proposal evaluations, WSF will rank the proposals and select the best
5 qualified proposers for participation in Phase II, pursuant to RCW 47.60.816(5). The
6 selection will be based upon which proposals meet the Minimum Requirements and
7 receive the highest scores in the evaluation process, subject to the provisions below.
8

9 As stated in the Phase I Proposal Instructions document in this RFP Volume, **unless**
10 **all proposals are rejected, WSF will select a maximum of three (3) proposers for**
11 **participation in Phase II based on the selection process described herein.** In the
12 event a selected proposer elects not to participate at any time after selection, WSF
13 reserves the right to select the next best qualified proposer (not previously selected)
14 for participation in Phase II.
15

16 **Note: The actual number of proposers selected to participate in Phase II may**
17 **be less than the maximum number specified above.** WSF will make such
18 determination based upon which proposals are “best qualified” to participate in Phase
19 II, pursuant to RCW 47.60.816(5).
20

21
22 **7. RFP PROCESS EXTENSION**
23

24 WSF reserves the right, upon prior notice to all proposers, to request submittal of
25 revised proposals, if necessary, in order to obtain competitive proposals that comply
26 with the RFP requirements for participation in the development of Technical
27 Proposals in Phase II.
28
29
30
31

(END)

PART 6

EXHIBIT A

**SUMMARY OF
PHASE I EVALUATION FACTORS**

PART 6 EXHIBIT A

WASHINGTON STATE FERRIES

NEW 130 – AUTO FERRIES

DESIGN AND BUILD CONTRACT

SUMMARY OF PHASE I EVALUATION FACTORS

| FACTORS | VALUE |
|--|--------------|
| A. <u>Shipyard Facilities</u> | 25% |
| 1. General arrangement of facilities. | |
| 2. Building ways, drydocks, marine railway, synchro-lift or other module integration facilities. | |
| 3. Shop facilities (machine, shipfitter, sheetmetal, etc.). | |
| 4. Weight handling capabilities. | |
| 5. Lay down areas. | |
| 6. Outfitting piers. | |
| 7. Warehousing, material storage facilities and OFE storage facilities. | |
| 8. Utility services. | |
| 9. Testing facilities and laboratories. | |
| 10. Medical facilities. | |
| 11. Office space and facilities for WSF personnel. | |
| B. <u>Design Capability</u> | 20% |
| 1. In-house design or organization. | |
| 2. Design subcontractor organization. | |
| 3. Design subcontractor work and interface. | |

FACTORS**VALUE****C. Build Strategy****15%**

1. Approach to construction.
2. Technical plan.
3. Production plan.
4. Material procurement plan.
5. Ability to meet vessel delivery dates.

D. Experience and Past Performance**15%**

1. Vessel design experience.
2. Vessel design performance.
3. Vessel construction experience.
4. Vessel construction performance.

E. Organization, Systems and Procedures**25%**

1. Shipyard organization.
2. Management and control systems.
3. Production capability.
4. Material acquisition and control capability.
5. Quality program capability.
6. Security and safety.
7. Regulatory compliance.
8. Financial systems.

TOTAL :**100%****(END)**

PART 6

EXHIBIT B

**SUMMARY OF
PHASE I EVALUATION PROCESS**

PART 6 EXHIBIT B

WASHINGTON STATE FERRIES

NEW 130 – AUTO FERRIES

DESIGN AND BUILD CONTRACT

SUMMARY OF PHASE I EVALUATION PROCESS

1 The following is a summary of the Phase I proposal evaluation process that Washington State
2 Ferries (WSF) will utilize for the modified Request For Proposals (RFP).

3
4
5 **1. EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

6
7 A Proposal Evaluation Panel and a Source Selection Official have been established
8 for this RFP. The Evaluation Panel will evaluate the proposals and the Source
9 Selection Official will provide an independent review of the Panel's recommendation
10 (see Section 4 below). Panel members are briefed and made aware of the requirement
11 for complete written documentation of the individual strengths and weaknesses that
12 affect the proposal evaluations.

13
14 The Proposal Evaluation Panel Chair reviews the RFP package in consultation with
15 the Director, Legal Services and Contracts. The Panel members are instructed that,
16 until selection, information concerning the proposals must not be disclosed to any
17 person not directly involved in the evaluation process or the review thereof. The
18 proposal evaluations are held in strict confidence to protect the competitive nature of
19 the RFP.

20
21
22 **2. INITIAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION**

23
24 After the Phase I Proposal Due Date, the Proposal Evaluation Panel will evaluate the
25 proposals in accordance with the Proposal Evaluation Procedure in order to: (i)
26 determine proposal compliance with the RFP Minimum Requirements; and (ii) to
27 score each proposal pursuant to the specified evaluation factors.

28
29 In the event that WSF determines that information or documentation required under
30 this RFP has not been included in a proposal, WSF will request that the proposer
31 provide such information within a specified time frame.
32

1 **A PROPOSER'S FAILURE TO RESPOND ADEQUATELY TO WSF'S**
2 **REQUEST MAY RESULT IN AUTOMATIC DISQUALIFICATION OF THAT**
3 **FIRM'S PROPOSAL FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION.**
4

5 Additionally, WSF reserves the right to send a team to any or all of the shipyard
6 locations of a proposer to substantiate proposal documentation.
7

8
9 **3. PROPOSAL DISCUSSIONS**
10

11 After initial proposal evaluations, WSF will determine whether it needs to conduct
12 oral and/or written discussions with each proposer in order to obtain additional
13 information or clarify certain issues, if necessary. In such event, proposers will have
14 an opportunity to support, clarify, correct, improve or revise their proposals, all by a
15 common cut-off date. WSF will advise each proposer in advance and provide a list of
16 items for discussion. Such discussions may occur at WSF's offices or at the
17 proposer's shipyard. Reference to the content of other proposals will be avoided
18 during such discussions.
19

20 WSF comments, requests and recommendations regarding a specific proposal will be
21 kept confidential during this proposal discussion process. Modification of RFP
22 content or other common information that is necessary or appropriate for all
23 proposers will be issued by RFP Addenda.
24

25
26 **4. FINAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION**
27

28 WSF will conduct final proposal evaluation upon: (i) completion of the initial
29 proposal evaluations, if no proposal discussions are deemed necessary; or (ii) after
30 proposal discussions with proposers, and receipt of any requested supplemental
31 information. The Evaluation Panel will evaluate and score the proposals in
32 accordance with the Proposal Evaluation Procedure.
33

34 After establishing an evaluation score for each final proposal, the Proposal Evaluation
35 Panel will produce a final proposal evaluation report recommending either: (i)
36 selection of the proposers which are best qualified, considering the evaluation factors
37 set forth in the RFP; or (ii) rejection of all proposals.
38
39

1
2 **5. SELECTION**
3

4 After reviewing the final proposal evaluation report, the Source Selection Official
5 may: (i) endorse the Panel's recommendation for selection or rejection, as provided
6 above; (ii) endorse the Panel's (optional) recommendation for submittal of revised
7 proposals; or (iii) request further review of the Panel's recommendation.
8

9 WSF will select the best qualified proposers for participation in Phase II based upon
10 the final evaluation scores.
11
12
13
14

15 (END)